



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Northern District of Illinois
219 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Thomas G. Bruton
Clerk

312-435-5670

12/12/24

Mariyana T. Spyropoulos, Clerk
Circuit Court of Cook County
Richard J. Daley Center
50 W. Washington Street
Chicago, IL 60602

Re: In re: Ethylene Oxide Coordinated Pretrial Proceedings

USDC Case Number: See attachment

Circuit Court Case Number: See attachment

Dear Clerk:

A certified copy of an order entered on 12/03/202 by the Honorable Jorge L. Alonso,
remanding the above-entitled case back to the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois is
herewith transmitted to you for your files.

Sincerely yours,
Thomas G. Bruton, Clerk

By: /s/ T. Davis
Deputy Clerk

Enclosure(s)

A TRUE COPY-ATTEST
 THOMAS G. BRUTON, CLERK
 By: s/ TIANA DAVIS
 DEPUTY CLERK
 U.S. DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN
 DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
 December 12, 2024

In re: Ethylene Oxide Coordinated Pre-

Case No. 24 C 7261

Proceedings

Judge Jorge L. Alonso

Memorandum Opinion and Order

In these coordinated pretrial proceedings, Plaintiffs, along with Defendants Vantage Specialty Chemicals., Inc. (“Vantage”) and Medline Industries, LP (“Medline”), seek to remand the cases, which were removed from Illinois state court by Defendants Isomedix Operations, Inc. (“Isomedix”), Cosmed Group, Inc. (“Cosmed”), PPG Industries, Inc. (“PPG”), and BASF Corporation (“BASF”). For the reasons below, the Court remands the cases forthwith. The Court also denies Plaintiffs’ motion for leave to file an exhibit under seal (ECF No. 33) and Isomedix and Cosmed’s motion to strike (ECF No. 41) as moot.

Background

Plaintiffs are individuals who have sued one or more Defendants for allegedly polluting the air with ethylene oxide, a carcinogenic gas. For years, these cases were proceeding in Illinois state court along with others. Earlier this year, however, Medline and Vantage—the only defendants who are Illinois citizens for jurisdictional purposes—reached settlement agreements with Plaintiffs.

Medline’s “Group Settlement Agreement” with plaintiffs provides that Plaintiffs will receive payments and dismiss their claims against Medline to the extent that Plaintiffs’ medical records are timely submitted, medical claims are unchallenged, and each Plaintiff accepts the amount allocated for them. (*See* ECF No. 17-1 ¶¶ 2–7.) The settlement also must be found by a court to have been reached in good faith under the Illinois Joint Tortfeasor Contribution Act, 740

ILCE 100/2(c). (*Id.* ¶ 8.) Further, Medline may walk away from the settlement around January 2025 if certain participation thresholds are not met. (*Id.* ¶ 9.) If so, or to the extent the other prerequisites are not met, the cases will continue against Medline on the merits. (*See id.*)

Plaintiffs have been negotiating and finalizing a similar settlement agreement with Vantage, which likewise would allow each Plaintiff to accept the settlement program or not, will require judicial sign-off, and will give Vantage a walk-away right in early 2025. (*Id.* ¶¶ 12–15.)

During a July 17, 2024 hearing in state court, the presiding judge stated that he believed Medline and Vantage had become nominal defendants given the settlements and invited the other defendants to remove the cases to federal court because, excluding Medline and Vantage, complete diversity existed for jurisdictional purposes. (ECF No. 26-1 at 18:12–24.)

In the weeks that followed, the other defendants removed these cases to this District without Medline or Vantage’s consent, and the cases now are being coordinated before this Court for pretrial proceedings.¹ (*See* ECF No. 1.) Plaintiffs, along with Defendants Vantage and Medline and opposed by the other Defendants, have moved to remand these cases to state court. (ECF Nos. 9, 17, 18.) Plaintiffs also move to seal the redacted settlement term sheet between Plaintiffs’ counsel and Vantage, which they attach to their reply brief. (ECF No. 33.) Cosmed and Isomedix oppose Plaintiffs’ motion to seal and have moved to strike it. (ECF No. 41.) The Court now considers the motions to remand, seal, and strike.²

Legal Standard

Section 1447(c) requires a court to remand a case “[i]f at any time before final judgment it appears that the district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction.” 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). For a case

¹ The coordinated cases include related cases in this District that have been subsequently removed, including Nos. 24-cv-11476 and 24-cv-11591. (*See* ECF Nos. 1, 20, 56–57.)

² The Court denies Isomedix, Cosmed, and PPG’s requests for oral argument. (*See* ECF No. 52.)

to be within a federal court’s diversity jurisdiction, diversity of citizenship must be complete—meaning that no plaintiff may be a citizen of the same state as any defendant. *McCready v. eBay, Inc.*, 453 F.3d 882, 891 (7th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Hoosier Energy Rural Elec. Coop. v. Amoco Tax Leasing IV Corp.*, 34 F.3d 1310, 1314–15 (7th Cir. 1994)). “The party seeking removal has the burden of establishing federal jurisdiction, and federal courts should interpret the removal statute narrowly, resolving any doubt in favor of the plaintiff’s choice of forum in state court.” *Schur v. L.A. Weight Loss Ctrs., Inc.*, 577 F.3d 752, 758 (7th Cir. 2009) (citation omitted); *see also Morris v. Nuzzo*, 718 F.3d 660, 670 (7th Cir. 2013). However, nominal parties—those against whom the plaintiff does not seek relief or who lack a reasonable basis for being held liable—are not considered when evaluating diversity jurisdiction. *See Jimenez v. Kiefer*, 100 F.4th 931, 936 (7th Cir. 2024).

Discussion

The Court considers first the motions to remand, then Plaintiffs’ motion to seal and Cosmed and Isomedix’s related motion to strike. As an aside, Cosmed has notified the Court that it has filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas. (ECF No. 58.) Though that triggers an automatic stay of proceedings, it does not prevent the Court from resolving the pending motions. *See County of Cook v. Mellon Stuart Co.*, 812 F. Supp. 793, 798 n.3 (N.D. Ill. 1992) (“The subsequent bankruptcy filing and resulting stay . . . do not prevent this court from remanding an improperly removed action.”).

1. Motions to Remand

As explained below, the Court concludes that all cases must be remanded, jurisdictional discovery is unwarranted, and fees and costs against Isomedix and Cosmed should not be imposed.

A. Remand generally

The removing defendants argue that removal was justified, and remand is inappropriate, because given Medline's and Vantage's settlements with the settling Plaintiffs, those defendants are effectively out of these cases and thus should be ignored for jurisdictional purposes. They claim that Medline and Vantage have substantively withdrawn from the litigations following the settlements and have not consistently attended or participated in discovery and other proceedings. They also emphasize the state court's description of Medline and Vantage as "nominal defendants only and in name only."

The Court disagrees with the removing defendants. To begin with, the state court's statements that Medline and Vantage are nominal parties in its view does not settle the issue—this Court must consider and resolve the issue itself. *See GE Betz, Inc. v. Zee Co.*, 718 F.3d 615, 631 (7th Cir. 2013) ("[T]he label assigned by state law to a party is not dispositive as to whether that party is a defendant for the purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1441."). Because Medline and Vantage remain defendants in these cases, the settlements are not and ultimately might not become finalized, the Court concludes that it lacks jurisdiction over these cases and remand is necessary.

Though it is possible, perhaps even highly probable, that Medline and Vantage's settlements ultimately will become final and they will be fully released from most if not all settling Plaintiffs' claims, there is still a reasonable basis for the settlements not to become final and for them to be liable to one or more settling Plaintiffs. For example, certain plaintiffs might not consent to settlement and continue pursuing litigation, Medline or Vantage might exercise a right to walk away from the settlement agreements before they are finalized, or a court might not accept the settlements. Thus, there are still reasonable avenues for each Medline and Vantage to be liable in these cases. And though Medline and Vantage do not appear to be a constant presence

in the merits litigation for these cases in state court following the settlement agreements, they have continued to participate in some capacity and shown that they have a stake in the litigation until their settlements are finalized.

Though outcomes have differed in other jurisdictions and the Seventh Circuit has not settled the issue, other judges in this District have agreed that parties are not considered nominal when their settlements are merely pending and they have not yet been dismissed from the case. *See Longobardi v. Honeywell Int’l Inc.*, No. 20 C 4367, 2020 WL 6581654, at *1–2 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 10, 2020) (remanding case where a defendant was merely “*almost* out of the case” and had not been dismissed from the suit, and reiterating prior remand where “the state court had not yet approved the settlement and therefore [a party] remained a defendant”); *Evers v. CEC Entm’t*, No. 10 C 6078, 2011 WL 995697, at *1–2 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 18, 2011) (remanding case where a settlement that purportedly rendered a party nominal was not yet accepted by a court, and collecting cases from outside this District). Here too, Medline and Vantage’s settlements have not been finalized and there are reasonable ways in which the settlements might yet be undone and some or all of these cases will continue against them on the merits—certain plaintiffs might not consent to the settlements, Medline or Vantage might walk away from the settlement under certain conditions beginning next month, and a court might not approve the settlements. *Cf. Jimenez*, 100 F.4th at 936 (finding a defendant to be nominal because plaintiffs “agreed that they would not seek to enforce the judgment against [him] so long as he cooperated with their suit, they sought no relief from him and there was no reasonable basis to predict that he would be held liable”). Therefore, neither Medline nor Vantage is a nominal defendant.

Because Medline and Vantage are not nominal defendants, their Illinois citizenship and lack of consent is considered for jurisdictional purposes and subject-matter jurisdiction thus does not exist under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. The Court therefore must remand these cases.³

B. *Bury, Holland, and Koklamanis* cases

PPG argues that three cases additionally lack diversity because they lack a plaintiff who is a citizen of Illinois and because Medline and Vantage, who are Illinois citizens, were not served prior to removal so the forum-defendant rule does not apply: *Bury v. BASF Corp.*, No. 24-cv-6243 (N.D. Ill), *Holland v. BASF Corp.*, No. 24-cv-6295, and *Koklamanis v. BASF Corp.*, No. 24-cv-6303. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1441 (b)(2). But as Plaintiffs point out, Medline did accept service of the complaints in those three cases in June 2024, before they were removed to federal court. The removals thus were improper, and remand is appropriate. *See id.* (removal is improper “if any of the parties in interest properly joined and served as defendants is a citizen of the State in which such action is brought”).

C. *Koch* case

One other case warrants additional discussion: *Koch v. BASF Corporation*, No. 24-cv-6249 (N.D. Ill.). PPG argues that *Koch* should not be remanded because Plaintiff Koch admittedly and uniquely settled her claims against Vantage, and Medline was not a party to the case at the time of removal. But as Plaintiffs point out in their reply, the operative complaint in *Koch* also includes two individual defendants—Mac Penman and David L. Van Lewen—who are Illinois defendants and thus destroy complete diversity on their own. (*See* ECF No. 1, No. 1:24-cv-6249 (N.D. Ill.).) Though PPG’s notice of removal claims that these two plaintiffs were

³ Because the Court finds that remand is appropriate on these grounds, it does not reach the parties’ additional arguments, including whether the removals were timely.

fraudulently joined, PPG has not developed its argument and has not carried its burden of proving fraudulent joinder and establishing subject-matter jurisdiction. *See Schur*, 577 F.3d at 764 (“Fraudulent joinder is difficult to establish A defendant faces a heavy burden[.]”). And though Plaintiffs raised their argument regarding Penman and Van Lewen in their reply, the argument is not waived since it addresses the Court’s subject-matter jurisdiction. *See Garcia v. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, No. 19-CV-1265, 2019 WL 7290556, at *3 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 30, 2019) (“Although arguments raised for the first time in a reply brief are typically waived, a challenge to subject matter jurisdiction may be raised at any time” (cleaned up)). The Court therefore remands the *Koch* case along with the others.

D. Jurisdictional discovery

Isomedix, Cosmed, and PPG ask the Court to permit jurisdictional discovery before remanding the case—in particular, they want to review Medline and Vantage settlement documents. The Court has discretion to permit jurisdictional discovery. *See Indag GmbH & Co. v. IMA S.P.A.*, 150 F. Supp. 3d 946, 971 (N.D. Ill. 2015). However, jurisdictional discovery is unwarranted here because the parties do not meaningfully dispute what is in the settlement documents the removing defendants seek to discover. They do not contest the moving parties’ descriptions of the Medline and Vantage settlements, and the relevant record is unambiguous that those settlements remain pending and are not a practical certainty as explained above. Allowing jurisdictional discovery as requested thus would do little beyond unnecessarily delaying remand. *Cf. WorkForce Software, LLC v. Workforce.com, Inc.*, No. 20 C 7365, 2021 WL 4963608, at *6 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 26, 2021) (“Jurisdictional discovery is appropriate where the factual record is ambiguous or unclear on the issue.”).

E. Plaintiffs' request for fees and costs against Isomedix and Cosmed⁴

Though the Court disagrees with the removing Defendants and remands these coordinated proceedings, it does not find that their actions warrant an award for fees and costs as Plaintiffs request. “An order remanding the case may require payment of just costs and any actual expenses, including attorney fees, incurred as a result of the removal.” 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). An award for fees and costs is warranted “only where the removing party lacked an objectively reasonable basis for seeking removal.” *Martin v. Franklin Capital Corp.*, 546 U.S. 132, 141 (2005). Remand was not a foregone conclusion, and even if the removing Defendants were unlikely to succeed in keeping these cases in federal court, they had colorable arguments to support removing these cases, especially following the state court’s belief that Medline and Vantage were nominal defendants and its invitation to remove the cases. *See Evers*, 2011 WL 995697, at *3 (denying fee request). The Court therefore denies Plaintiffs’ request for fees and costs against Isomedix and Cosmed.

2. Motion to seal and motion to strike

Plaintiffs attach a redacted version of the Vantage settlement term sheet to their reply brief as an exhibit and ask for leave to file that redacted agreement under seal. Isomedix and Cosmed oppose this and move to strike the exhibit.

The Court will strike the exhibit without prejudice, and the dispute is effectively moot. Plaintiffs have not adequately explained why their exhibit is already so heavily redacted and the remainder must be sealed—for example, it redacts or seeks to seal several terms that presumably were already publicly disclosed during the parties’ briefing. The Court is wary of allowing Plaintiffs to submit such a heavily redacted exhibit and seal what remains without more

⁴ Plaintiffs have withdrawn their request for fees and costs against PPG.

explanation. But at any rate, the Court has not relied on the unredacted provisions in the exhibit in reaching its remand decision. Relevant terms of Vantage's settlement with Plaintiffs were sufficiently, and uncontestedly, described in the other submitted materials and are enough for the Court to conclude that the Vantage settlement is not adequately finalized and subject-matter jurisdiction is lacking without needing to reference the term sheet or related arguments raised in Plaintiffs' reply. (*See* ECF No. 17-1 ¶¶ 11–15.) The Court therefore strikes Plaintiffs' exhibit (ECF No. 32) without prejudice and denies Plaintiffs' motion to seal (ECF No. 33) and Isomedix and Cosmed's motion to strike (ECF No. 41) as moot.

Conclusion

The Court grants in part and denies in part the motions to remand (ECF Nos. 9, 17, 18). These coordinated cases shall be remanded forthwith to the Circuit Court of Cook County. The Court denies Isomedix and Cosmed's motion to strike (ECF No. 41) and Plaintiffs' motion for leave to file document under seal (ECF No. 33) as moot. The other pending pretrial motions are denied as moot.⁵

SO ORDERED.

ENTERED: December 3, 2024



HON. JORGE ALONSO
United States District Judge

⁵ *E.g.*, ECF Nos. 45–47, No. 1:24-cv-3411 (N.D. Ill.); ECF No. 7, No. 1:24-cv-6315 (N.D. Ill.); ECF No. 8, No. 1:24-cv-6446 (N.D. Ill.).

USDC Case No	State Court Case No	USDC Case No	State Court Case No
1:24-cv-06393	2023L009950	1:24-cv-06337	2024L000255
1:24-cv-06236	2022L008599	1:24-cv-06252	2022L008676
1:24-cv-06244	2022L008644	1:24-cv-06399	2023L009587
1:24-cv-06245	2022L008669	1:24-cv-06338	2023L012977
1:24-cv-06247	2022L008677	1:24-cv-06255	2024L004991
1:24-cv-06249	2023L00686	1:24-cv-06257	2022L008670
1:24-cv-06260	2024L004721	1:24-cv-06400	2023L009496
1:24-cv-06262	2024L004715	1:24-cv-06340	2023L010826
1:24-cv-06303	2024L005130	1:24-cv-06261	2024L004861
1:24-cv-06305	2022L008595	1:24-cv-06343	2023L010069
1:24-cv-06312	2024L005092	1:24-cv-06401	2023L009498
1:24-cv-06315	2024L001467	1:24-cv-06344	2023L010160
1:24-cv-06316	2022L008658	1:24-cv-06264	2024L008656
1:24-cv-06319	2023 L 009566	1:24-cv-06402	2024L001723
1:24-cv-06323	2024 L 000256	1:24-cv-06345	2023L009752
1:24-cv-06325	2023L010144	1:24-cv-06266	2022L008634
1:24-cv-06327	2023L009569	1:24-cv-06346	2023L012177
1:24-cv-06332	2023L010354	1:24-cv-06403	2024L002511
1:24-cv-06339	2023L012614	1:24-cv-06267	2024L005093
1:24-cv-06341	2023 L 012178	1:24-cv-06349	2023-L-009583
1:24-cv-06342	2024L001175	1:24-cv-06404	2023-L-009456
1:24-cv-06347	2023 L 012768	1:24-cv-06269	2022L008580
1:24-cv-06348	2023L009759	1:24-cv-06350	2023L009453
1:24-cv-06362	2023-L-009495	1:24-cv-06270	2022L008643
1:24-cv-06398	2024L002454	1:24-cv-06405	2023L012290
1:24-cv-06458	2023L009572	1:24-cv-06351	2024L002015
1:24-cv-06254	2022L008651	1:24-cv-06271	2022L008583
1:24-cv-06298	2022L008647	1:24-cv-06352	2024 L 002232
1:24-cv-06317	2024L004997	1:24-cv-06406	2023-L-012048
1:24-cv-03411	2023-L-009581	1:24-cv-06274	2022L008587
1:24-cv-06233	2023L009584	1:24-cv-06353	2023-L-007590
1:24-cv-06331	2023L009647	1:24-cv-06276	2022L008581
1:24-cv-06237	2022L008649	1:24-cv-06407	2023L009699
1:24-cv-06396	2023L009463	1:24-cv-06354	2023L009469
1:24-cv-06333	2024 L 001461	1:24-cv-06416	2023 L 009658
1:24-cv-06239	2022 L 008415	1:24-cv-06279	2022 L 008717
1:24-cv-06397	2023L009561	1:24-cv-06356	2023-L-012288
1:24-cv-06243	2024L004995	1:24-cv-06280	2022L008609
1:24-cv-06334	2023L012039	1:24-cv-06417	2023L011677
1:24-cv-06248	2024-L-005112	1:24-cv-06357	2023-L-009482
1:24-cv-06398	2024L002454	1:24-cv-06283	2022L006655
1:24-cv-06335	2024-L-001174	1:24-cv-06358	2024-L-000708
1:24-cv-06251	2024L005186	1:24-cv-06418	2023 L 009949

USDC Case No	State Court Case No	USDC Case No	State Court Case No
1:24-cv-06287	2024L005095	1:24-cv-06374	2023-L-010147
1:24-cv-06359	2023-L-009577	1:24-cv-06450	2023-L-009485
1:24-cv-06292	2024L005055	1:24-cv-06320	2023L010328
1:24-cv-06360	2023-L-009493	1:24-cv-06375	2023L009586
1:24-cv-06420	2023L009475	1:24-cv-06321	2023L009592
1:24-cv-06361	2023-L-009694	1:24-cv-06451	2023L009757
1:24-cv-06294	2024L004924	1:24-cv-06376	2023L010834
1:24-cv-06424	2023-L- 009580	1:24-cv-06322	2023L009479
1:24-cv-06363	2023-L-012287	1:24-cv-06453	2023L008150
1:24-cv-06295	2024L005187	1:24-cv-06377	2023L009487
1:24-cv-06425	2023L010093	1:24-cv-06454	2023-L-009486
1:24-cv-06364	2023-L-009491	1:24-cv-06328	2024 L 001525
1:24-cv-06430	2023L009483	1:24-cv-06378	2023L010838
1:24-cv-06365	2023L009454	1:24-cv-06455	2023L010355
1:24-cv-06431	2023L009582	1:24-cv-06379	2023L010838
1:24-cv-06297	2024L001586	1:24-cv-06457	2023-L-011678
1:24-cv-06366	2023-L-009488	1:24-cv-06329	2023 L 010356
1:24-cv-06437	2023L009503	1:24-cv-06458	2023L009572
1:24-cv-06302	2023L012285	1:24-cv-06381	2023L009561
1:24-cv-06231	2022L008661	1:24-cv-06330	2023L012051
1:24-cv-06442	2023L009563	1:24-cv-06382	2023L009565
1:24-cv-06235	2022L008307	1:24-cv-06459	2023-L-009575
1:24-cv-06367	2023-L-009590	1:24-cv-06383	2023L009496
1:24-cv-06304	2022L008572	1:24-cv-06460	2023L012507
1:24-cv-06443	2024-L-001526	1:24-cv-06384	2024L002653
1:24-cv-06368	2023L009455	1:24-cv-06492	2023-L-009573
1:24-cv-06306	2024L004999	1:24-cv-06461	2023-L-009702
1:24-cv-06307	2024L005106	1:24-cv-06385	2023L012978
1:24-cv-06369	2023-L-009462	1:24-cv-06386	2023L012124
1:24-cv-06444	2024L000087	1:24-cv-06494	2023-L- 012053
1:24-cv-06308	2024L005053	1:24-cv-06462	2023L010828
1:24-cv-06445	2023L009508	1:24-cv-06497	2024L001226
1:24-cv-06370	2023L009562	1:24-cv-06463	2023-L-010452
1:24-cv-06309	2024L004993	1:24-cv-06387	2023L009641
1:24-cv-06446	2024-L-001172	1:24-cv-06499	2024-L- 001578
1:24-cv-06371	2023-L-012501	1:24-cv-06388	2023L012821
1:24-cv-06310	2024L004841	1:24-cv-06464	2023L009653
1:24-cv-06311	2024L004925)	1:24-cv-06503	2023-L- 010833
1:24-cv-06447	2023L009464	1:24-cv-06389	2023L010834
1:24-cv-06372	2023-L-009564	1:24-cv-06509	2023-L- 009755
1:24-cv-06314	2022L008623	1:24-cv-06465	2023-L-009753
1:24-cv-06373	2023-L-009848	1:24-cv-06391	2023L009571
1:24-cv-06449	2023L009511	1:24-cv-06511	2023-L- 009478

USDC Case No	State Court Case No
1:24-cv-06318	2022L004891
1:24-cv-06466	2023L009509
1:24-cv-06392	2023L009487
1:24-cv-06516	2023-L- 009574
1:24-cv-06394	2023L009974
1:24-cv-06467	2023-L-009590
1:24-cv-06517	2023-L-008151
1:24-cv-06395	2023L010838
1:24-cv-06468	2024-L-002079
1:24-cv-06520	2024L004927
1:24-cv-06524	2023L010003
1:24-cv-06469	2024L001422
1:24-cv-06525	2024-L-002444
1:24-cv-06470	2024L001529
1:24-cv-06528	2023-L- 010827
1:24-cv-06471	2023L009504
1:24-cv-06529	2023L012291
1:24-cv-06475	2023L009952
1:24-cv-06476	2023-L-012767
1:24-cv-06532	2023-L-009579
1:24-cv-06477	2023-L-009754
1:24-cv-06535	2023-L- 010146
1:24-cv-06483	2023L009500
1:24-cv-06547	2023-L-009570
1:24-cv-06484	2023L009499
1:24-cv-06548	2023-L-012971
1:24-cv-06488	2023L009494
1:24-cv-06551	2023-L-009468
1:24-cv-06570	2023L012824
1:24-cv-06571	2024L001277
1:24-cv-06572	2024L001495
1:24-cv-06552	2023-L-009560
1:24-cv-06617	2023L009649
1:24-cv-06553	2024-L-001228
1:24-cv-06619	2023L009489
1:24-cv-06554	2023-L-009648
1:24-cv-06555	2024-L-002455
1:24-cv-06557	2023-L-010094
1:24-cv-06558	2023-L-009559
1:24-cv-06561	2024-L-001577
1:24-cv-06568	2023-L-009474